

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 14 are in this application and are presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following comments.

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0043768 published March 6, 2003 for Chang et al. (*Chang*). Applicants continue to respectfully disagree.

Applicants' claim 1 clearly requires:

processing a second synchronization channel of the received wireless signal to acquire frame synchronization in such a way that the first synchronization channel is used to adjust for a frequency offset.

This is simply NOT described or shown in *Chang*. During phase II acquisition – when frame synchronization is performed (*Chang*, paragraph [0038]) – no adjustment for frequency offset occurs. This is clearly shown in FIG. 3 of *Chang*, where frequency correction is performed **well after phase II, indeed after phase IV**.

As such, Applicants respectfully maintain their position that *Chang* does not describe, or suggest, adjusting for frequency offset using the first synchronization channel while processing a second synchronization channel to acquire frame synchronization.

As a result of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over *Chang*. Consequently, claims 2 to 5 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chang* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,298 issued May 6, 2003 to Froehling et al. (*Froehling*). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons described above with respect to Applicants' claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner's comment that one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually, Applicants will respectfully re-phrase their arguments.

In addition, Applicants respectfully note that the combination of *Chang* and *Froehling* does not describe, or suggest, Applicants' claimed invention. Nowhere does *Froehling* even describe using slot synchronization for estimating frequency offset. In fact, the word "slot" only occurs twice in *Froehling* at col. 2, ln. 39, and col. 8, ln. 32. Indeed, the determination of a "slot" in *Froehling* appears to be associated with element 211 and 220 in FIG. 2 of *Froehling* and has nothing to do with element 216 in FIG. 2 of *Froehling*. As such, the combination of *Chang* and *Froehling* does not describe Applicants' claimed invention.

Further, *Froehling* teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention, as *Froehling* adjusts for a frequency offset using fixed frequency offsets. (*Froehling*, col. 13, lns. 2-67.) Thus, *Froehling* does not even suggest using slot synchronization for estimating frequency offset as claimed by Applicants.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-14 are patentable over *Chang* in view of *Froehling*.

As it is believed that all of the objections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' attorney in order to overcome any additional objections that the Examiner might have.

Respectfully submitted  
Louis Robert Litwin et al.

Joseph J. Opalach  
Registration No.: 36,229  
(609) 734-6839

9